G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Revenue
15734

1917-18

(Medical.)

File No. 5-16

Serial

Later references.

M/J 238-32 & 1-7
Rev 5-24-1-6

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-11

Part B for June 1917

SUBJECT.

Remission of Rs 10/- due from Mr. B. W. Lawrence on account of the X ray charges in the Victoria Hospital, Bangalore.

---

11 G.O.Ns. 8421-39 29.6.17 & the Secy. Surgeon &c. Sanctioning the writing off the accounts &c. &c. duly & above.

9/2

23.9.17.

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-18

1610

B. R. S. 11] 1916-7

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Med.)

NOTES.

File No. 5-16

FILE HEADING.

Suits for recovery of dues to the Medical Deptt

From

The Govt Advocate in Mysore

No. 74 Dated 30.8.16 Received 4.9.16

Diary No. 797	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

With refce to G.O. No: 5566-8 dd 1.2.16 States that he has filed an petitionin appn in the Chief Court requesting permission to amend the plaint and requests issue of a Govt order in the terms suggested.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1) Subd with a draft order as proposed by the Govt Advocate. Branch III may, if deemed, necessary be consulted before issuing the order. It is for Consideration whether the proposed order may not issue from the Judl Branch.

Rdn-39 6.9.16

2) For III to favour of opinion

8/9-16

J Mes 4/9/16

cto 8/9

NOTES—First Sheet.

(2)

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Govt File No. 5 of 1916.

Serial No.

3) Subd. There seems to be no necessity for issuing the order from Br III. The law requires that the plaint in any suit by Govt should be signed & verified by any person appointed by Govt... Where a special order, as is contemplated, has to be passed, it seems best to issue it from the administrative Branch concerned. Draft is all right and may be issued from Adm' Branch.
8/9/16 Govt

4) Subd. Draft order for appl
9.9.16

5) Approved
9.9.16

6) Issue
15/9/16

7) Seen.
18.9.16.

8) Issue today
19/9/16

α
III

325
14.9

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000. 17.12.15

1096 (3

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Misd File No. 5 of 1916-7

Serial No.	
9) 1	To the Govt advocate, the Senior Surgeon and the Public Prosecutor, Bangalore Division
2	G.O. No: 2007-99/19.9.16
	Issues the order suggested by the Govt advocate in Sl 1.
10) 3	Letter No: 111 dy 29.9.16 from the Govt-Advocate In continuation of Sl 1 forwards a copy of the order of the Chief Court allowing the application to withdraw the suit in question with liberty to bring a fresh one
11)	As the order of the Chief Court is stated to have been communicated to the Senior Surgeon & the Public Prosecutor of Bangalore, it may perhaps be presumed that either of them will take needful action in the matter of filing a fresh suit. May these papers be filed ~~& kept in Sl. Office till the result of the fresh suit is reported to Govt~~?
Rdr 39 9.10.16 BC 12/10	12) The Senior Surgeon has been authorized to take all further action himself - G.O. dy 1.2.16
	13) Ors. May be filed D.M. 14.10.16

L IV S. 44 3

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000—17-12-15

1213 (4

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Revd File No. 5 of 1916-7

Serial No. 4

14) Letter no 44 of 16.10.16 from the Public Prosecutor Bangalore Stn—

With refce to Sl 2 points out that the number and year of the Suit in question is 316 of 1915-6 and not 71 and requests therefor further instructions in the matter.

15) The Govt Advocate may, if appd, be Consulted unoffly as to whether the number ~~of~~ of the Suit Specified in his letter (Sl 1) is incorrect as pointed out by the Public Prosecutor and if it is necessary for legal purposes to issue another Govt order afresh on the lines of the G.O of 19.9.16 (Sl 2) or whether it is sufficient to issue an erratum to that order directing that the no: 71 be ~~corrected~~ altered to 316

Rdm-39 20.10.16 Submtd for orders.

H.O No 428 20-10-16

16) Forwarded with Compliments to the Govt Advocate for favour of opinion. By order D. Mahadevappa 20.10.16 Dy Govt Secy

dated, 20th Oct/16.

17) H.O. 26 of 16-7 S.C. no 71 of 15/16, which is the number given in the Chief Court is a clerical Error for S.C no 316 of 15.16 which is the no given in the Mysore Court

W CM 24 OCT 1916

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G.P.P.—70 000—17.12.15

1213

(5

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Ined File No. 5 of 1916-17

Serial No.

During the pendency of the Revision petition in the Chief Court the notification in the terms suggested by me authorising the Senior Surgeon & the Public Pros^r jointly & severally to sign & verify the plaint was necessary, in order to support the contention I raised as to the maintainability of the suit in the form in which it was filed, or to permit the amendment asked for by me - But as the Chief Court was of opinion that the contention involved straining of the language of the Code, I had no alternative but to ask for permission to withdraw the suit with liberty to file another & it was granted. With the withdrawal of the suit which shall have to be done now the notification now issued will cease to be operative - In these circumstances no alteration is necessary -

18) If it is in the contemplation of Govt to file another suit a fresh notification authorising

Put up
20/10

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000—17-12-15

(6

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Chd File No. 5 of 1916-7

Serial No.

such officer as may be from personal knowledge acquainted with the facts of the case to sign & verify the plaint in the proposed suit may issue. Perhaps the medical officer in charge of the Victoria Hospital is acquainted with the facts of the case as the claim relates to unpaid charges for X ray photo. In that case he may be authorised -

19) The Public Pros^r. may be directed to withdraw the present suit & file another duly signed & verified by the officer in whose name the Notification may issue.

24.10.16.

S Doraiswamiyer
for Advocate

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—75,000—17-12-15

G. R. S. 12]

1213
1296

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Med File No. 5 of 1916.)

Serial No.

20) Subtd with the U.O. perfly from the Govt Advocate. As G.O of 19.9.16 (Sl 2) is stated to have become inoperative, it seems unnecessary to issue an erratum ~~cancelling~~ directing the alteration of the no: of the Suit from 71 to 316.

21) In regard to the filing of a fresh Suit, the Senior Surgeon may be consulted unofficially as to whether it is necessary to institute a fresh Suit for the recovery of the Amount due by Mrs W. Lawrence & if so, whether the Senior Surgeon himself or the medical officer in charge of the Victoria Hospl may be authorized to sign & verify the plaint in the fresh Suit.

Adm-39
30.10.16

22) Letter no: 50 of 30.10.16 from the Public Prosecutor of the Bangalore Dn.

5 Solicits instructions in the matter of bringing a fresh Suit against Mrs Lawrence in view of the order of the Chief Court in Revision ~~petn~~ Case no: 71 of 1916-7.

23) Subtd for orders with reference to paragraphs 21 above & the Govt Advocate's ~~unofficial~~ opinion.

Adm-39
31.10.16

24) Mano requests vn Mde: Mrs

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70.000—17 12-15

G. R. S. 12]

(8

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mcd File No. 5 of 1916.)

Serial No.

to state whether there is no bar of limitation to file as fresh suit.

D. M.
31.10.16.

25) Draft- Subtd
Dhn-39
31.10.16.

26) Same
D. M.
31.10.16

27)

6. To. The Public Prosecutor
Bangalore.
No 26 78/5-16-6.

Enquires whether there is no bar of limitation to file a fresh suit against Mr. Lawrence for the recovery of the amount due by him.

28)

7 From the Public Prosecutor, Bangalore Division
D. O. No: nil dy 1.11.16.

States with refee to Sl 6 that as Article 149 of the Imperial Limitation Regn of 1911 provides a 60 years' period of limitation in Suits by or on behalf of Govt, he believes there is no bar of limitation to file a fresh Suit against Mr Lawrence.

Subtd.

Dhn-39
2.11.16
Bo

29) The suit was dismissed by the 1st Munsiff of Bangalore on the ground that the plaint had been signed & verified by

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70 000—17-12-15

G. R. S. 12]

(9

1384

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Med File No. 5 of 1916-7

Serial No.

the Med^{l} Officer, Victoria Hosp^{l}, instead of by the Senior Surgeon who had been authorised by Govt to take the necessary steps. The case was taken to the Chief Court on the Rev^{e} side. & the suit was eventually withdrawn with liberty to bring a fresh suit. Though the amount intended to be recovered is small, the principle involved is of some importance, and it is not desirable to drop the matter after having proceeded so far. The Dist: Prosecutor says that there is no bar of limitation to file a fresh suit, and if approved, he will be requested to file a fresh suit

St: 2

30) Since the previous notif^{n} is no longer operative, a fresh notif^{n} has to be issued authorising the Med^{l} Officer in charge of the Victoria Hosp^{l} to sign & verify the plaint as suggested by the Govt Advocate.

Sub^{d} for favour of orders.

Dharmaratnam
2.11.16

~~L S~~ ~~E 34~~ C III

Govt: Secretary)

31) The file may be submitted to the Local Dumba with address as proposed.

Dumba
3/11

B2
3/11

32) Please put up draft by 2 p.m.
3.11.16

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000—17 12-15

1384 (10)

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Med File No. 5 of 1914-7

Serial No.

33) Draft - G.O. Lstd.
Adm-39
3.11.16
Be

In favour of approval
D. M.
4.11.16

109
4.11.16

II Member)

34) This is a small amount. Cannot this be amicably Collected
4.11

35) S.S may be asked demi officially
Done
4/11/16

36) Please put up draft
D. M.
4.11.16

Put
by 11

37) Draft (D.O) Lstd.
Adm-39
6.11.16
Be

I agree
D. M.
6.11.16

8 To the Senior Surgeon. D.O. No. 2838 & 8.11.16
Invites reference to Sl 2 and enquires whether the Sum of Rs 10 due by Mr Lawrence may not be amicably collected.

From

9 The Same officer. No. DO 145 & 16-1-17.
Reports that the attempts of the medical officer in Charge of the Victoria Hospital to recover the sum of Rs 10 from Mr Lawrence have failed and that he has been requested to make one more attempt.

10 From The Same officer No. G 393 & 21.5.17
Reports that there is no chance of recovering Rs 10 being amicably recovered

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—70,000—17-12-15

3400

WD 1223—GTB—60,000—1-12-16—S.

.G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Secret File No. 5 of 1916-7

Serial No.

from Mr Lawrence who is reported to be an inmate of the Lunatic Asylum, Madras

(36) Submitted with reference to para 34 above.

(37) The point for orders is whether the small sum of Rs 100 may be ordered to be written off the accounts or the Public Prosecutor directed to file a fresh suit against Mr Lawrence.

K.P. 30/5/17

(38) In view of the fact that the defendant is an inmate of the Lunatic Asylum, the amount may be remitted and written off the accounts and further proceedings dropped.

MK 31.5.17

Extraordinary Member)

(39) Yes.

26.6.17.

(40) Draft put up for approval MK 25/6

K.P. 26/6/17

Issue MK 27/6.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 1233—GPE—60,000—1-12-16—S.

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

120 File No. 5 of 1916-17

Serial No.	
	Do
11	The Senior Surgeon " Comptroller " Government Advocate. Order No 8421-3 Dy 29.6.17 States that under the circumstances reported, the sum of Rs 10/— will be written off the accounts.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

5-16

No. 794
E.L. one

BEN. & REV. SCOTT
2 SEP 1916

Office of the Government Advocate in Mysore,

Bangalore, dated the 30th August 1916.

From D797
Med 5-16-1
The Government Advocate in Mysore,

Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to the Government of H.H.
the Maharaja of Mysore, General Department,

Sir,

With reference to G.O.No.5566-8 Med.95-15-2 dated the 1st February 1916, I have the honor to state that the Revision Petition (Civil Revision Petition No.71 of 1915-16) came on for hearing on the 23rd instant, before the Chief Court. As the result of the arguments addressed in the matter I have filed an application to-day requesting permission to amend the plaint and in all likelihood the permission will be granted after hearing the opponent who will again be notified. In the meantime, it is desirable that I should be armed with a G.O. in the following terms.

"Under Order 27, Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, Government are pleased to appoint the Senior

Surgeon to Government and the Public Prosecutor, Bangalore Division, and empower them jointly and severally to sign and verify the plaint in the manner required by law in S.C. Suit No. 71 of 1915-16 on the file of the 1st Munsiff of Bangalore".

A copy of the application filed to-day is -- herewith sent for the information of Government.

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

J Exa & Red 5-16-1

IN THE CHIEF COURT OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Civil Revision Petition No.71 of 1915-16.

Government of Mysore ... Petitioner,

VS.

B.W.Lawrence ... Opponent,

Under O 6, R 17 read with section 141, Civil Procedure Code, and O 23, R 1 read with section 141, Civil Procedure Code, the Petitioner abovenamed begs to state as follows:---

1. On behalf of Government, S.C.No,316 of 1915-16 was instituted in the Court of the 1st Munsif of Bangalore, against the opponent for the recovery of Rs.10/- being the charges due by him to the Victoria Hospital for X ray photos taken for him at his instance.

2. Sanction for instructing the Public Prosecutor for the recovery through Court of the said sum was obtained by the Senior Surgeon to Government in G.O.No. 7353-4 Med. 124-14-2 dated the 20th March 1915 and the Senior Surgeon, in his turn, directed the Medical Officer of the Victoria Hospital in Memo No. 4936 dated the 27th March 1915, to take the necessary steps to file the suit in communication with the Public Prosecutor, Bangalore.

3. The said S,C. suit 316 of 1915-16 was accordingly filed, the plaint having been signed

and verified by the Medical Officer, Victoria Hospital; the Public Prosecutor also signed the plaint as Advocate for the Plaintiff.

4. The Defendant inter alia raised the plea that the Medical Officer, Victoria Hospital was - not competent either to sign or verify the plaint inasmuch as as he was not the officer appointed by Government by general or special order in this behald and it was further contended that that officer was not ex-officio or otherwise authorised to act for Government in respect of judicial proceedings.

5. The Defendant's contention was uphold and the suit was dismissed with costs.

6. In his letter to Government No.365 dated the 24th February 1915, the Senior Surgeon sought the permission of Government to his, requesting - the Public Prosecutor to recover the amount in - question through court.

7. In these circumstances the petitioner begs to state that if, neither the Medical officer's action in signing and verifying the plaint, nor the - signature of the Public Prosecutor affixed to the - plaint as advocate for the plaintiff is deemed sufficient in law to satisfy the requirements of O 27, R 1 and 2 of Civil Procedure Code, the petitioner m may be permitted to amend the plaint by striking off the signature of the Medical Officer in the plaint and substituting therefor, the signatures of the - Senior Surgeon to Government; or the Public Prosecutor Bangalore or in the alternative to permit the plaintiff to withdraw the suit with

liberty

5

liberty to file another sui on the same cause of action, in case the amendmelt prayed for is not - granted.

Ex C. S. Dorrancemidge
30 August 1916 Govern't Attorney

Govern't Attorney

Authorizes the Senior Surgeon & the Public Prosecutor, Bangalore &c to Sign & verify the plaint of a certain Suit

6

G.R.S. 28]

917

File No. 5-16

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to 797

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Revl)

~~READ~~

the 191

Date of issue 19-9-16

Signed by Mr B Subba Rao

ORDER ~~THEREON~~.—No. 2007-9/Revl 5-16-2 & 19-9-16.

Under Order XXVII, Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, Govt are pleased to appoint the Senior Surgeon with the Govt of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore and the Public Prosecutor,

over.

SUBJECT.

GPB—50,000—1-12-12

Bangalore Division and empower them jointly and severally, to sign and verify the plaint in the manner required by law in S.C. Suit no: 71 of 1915-16 on the file of the 1st Munsiff of Bangalore.

For Secy to Govt
Jud Dept

To The Govt Advocate in Mysore with reference to his letter no: 769 dated 30th Aug 16
" Senior Engineer in Contemplation of G.O. no: 5566-8 med 95-15-2 dated 1st Feby 16
" Public Prosecutor, Bangalore Dist

D 1096

8

No 111
and one

GEN. & REV. SEC.
30 SEP 1916

Office of the Government Advocate in
Mysore,
Bnaglore, dated 29th September 1916

Med 5-16 81:3

From

The Government Advocate in Mysore,

Bangalore.

9/10

To

The Secretary to the Government of H.H.
the Maharaja of Mysore, General Department.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No.74 dated the 30th August 1916, reporting the actions taken by me with reference to G.O.No. 5566-8/Med.95-12-2 dated the 1st February 1916, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Order of the Chief Court allowing the application to withdraw the suit with liberty to bring a fresh one.

2. Copies of the order of the Chief Court, in question, have also been forwarded to the Public Prosecutor, Bangalore and the Senior Surgeon in Mysore.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

9 Encl to med 5-16-3

IN THE CHIEF COURT OF MYSORE AT BANGALORE.

Monday, the 25th day of September 1916.

Present.

Sir LESLIE C.MILLER, Kt., Chief Judge,

a n d

Mr.Justice K.S.Chandrasekhara Iyer,

Civil Revision Petition No. 71 of 1915- 1916.

The Government of Mysore,
(The Resident Medical Officer,
Victoria Hospital, Bnagalore
C i t y). ....Plff ....Petitioner.

(By Mr.C.S.Doraswami Iyer, Government Advocate).

VS.

B.W.Lawrence. ....Deft. ...Opponent.

(Absent).

Civil Revision Petition against the order of the First Munsif of Bangalore in S.C.No.316 of 1915-16.

Read Civil Petition dated 30th August 1916, presented by Mr.C.S.Doraswami Iyer, Govt: Advocate, on behalf of Government, praying that he may be permitted to amend the plaint or to withdraw the suit with liberty to file another suit on the same cause of action.

This Petition coming on for hearing this day, the Court pronounced the following

O R D E R.

There is no opposition of the alternaive prayers. We think we should accept the prayer to be allowed to

to withdraw the suit with liberty to bring a fresh one,

and we make an order to that effect.

Sd/- Leslie C. Miller,

CHIEF JUDGE.

Sd/- K.S.Chandrasekhara Iyer,

JUDGE.

"C o p y"

Government Advocate.

11

D 1213

Med 5-16-4

From,

D. M. Ramachendra Rau Esquire, B. A., B. L.,

Public Prosecutor,

Bangalore Division.

To,

D. M. Narasinga Rau Esquire, B. A., B. L.,

General Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Bangalore.

NO: 44 of 16-17: 16 Oct: 16.

Sir,

With reference to Govt: proceedings No: 2007-/ Med-5-16-2, dat-ed 19th: Sep: 16, I have the honor to point out that the numbe & ~~nature~~ year of the suit is S. C. 316 of 15-16 & not No;71.I therefore solicit further instructions in the matter.

I have the honor to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

D M Ramachendra Rau

Public Prosecutor.

B Fit
Forwarded duly (M W
Regd. B/D

D 1296

From,

D. M. Ramachendra Rau Esquire,B.A,B.L,

Public Prosecutor,Bangalore Division.

To,

D. M. Narasinga Rau Esquire,B.A,B.L,

General Secretary to Government,Bangalore.

No:50 of 16-17:30 Oct: 16.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No:44 of 16-17 dated 16-10 16, I have the honor to state that I findthe Chief Court have, in Revision Case No:71 of 16-17, permitted Government to withdraw the suit with liberty to bring a fresh one against Mr: Lawrence. In case Government intend doing so, I believe fresh proceedings have to be issued authorising the Senior Surgeon to sign & verify the plaint & the Public Prosecutor to file & conduct it on behalf of Government. I solicit early instructions in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

D. M. Ramachendra Rau

Public Prosecutor,

Bangalore Division.

Re. filing a fresh Suit against
Mr Lawrence.

G. R. S. 26]

File No. 576
Serial No. 6

Diary No. of letter replied to 1296

No. 2678

General and Revenue Secretariat
(Med)
, *the* 191

Dear Sir, Med 5-16
Dy 31-10-16.

To

With refee. to your letter No 50 dated the 30th instant, I am desired to enquire whether there is no bar of limitation to file a fresh Suit against Mr Lawrence for the recovery of the Amount due by him on account of charges of x-ray photo taken in the Victoria Hospital, Bangalore, on the 18th April 12

Date of issue 31.10.16.

Signed by Mr P. Mahadevappa

Yours Sincerely
D M.

To
D. M. Ramachendra Rao Esq
Public Prosecutor,
Bangalore

SUBJECT.

14

1334/Med 5-16-7

Office of the Public Prosecutor
Bangalore Division,
Bangalore, 1 Nov: 16.

Dear Sir,

In reply to your enquiry No: 2678/ Med:5-16-6, I have to state that article 149 of the Mysore Limitation Regulation, 4 of 1911, provides 60 years' period of limitation in suits by or on behalf of the Government of Mysore. I believe therefore there is no bar of limitation to file a fresh suit against Mr: Lawrence.

Yours sincerely,

D. Ramachandra Rao

P. Mahadevayya Esquire, B. A, B. L.,
Assistant Secretary to Government,
Public Offices, Bangalore.

2-11-16
Please send the file to me
D.R.

2/11

G. K. S. 26]

Diary No. of letter replied to 1334

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Secl)

, the *191*

Date of issue 8.11.16

Signed by Mr D. M. Jayaratne

7/36-16

15

File No. 5/16

Serial No. 8

No. 2836

Dear Sir, Secl 8.11.16.

To

I am desired to invite refee to G.O. No: 2007-9 of the 19th September '16 and Secl 5-16-2 to enquire whether the Sum of Rs10 due by Mr Lawrence may not be amicably collected So as to Save the trouble & expense of filing a fresh Suit against him for the recovery of a Small amount.

Yours Sincerely

D M

To Rajakaryaprasina Rao Bahadur

J. V. Cumaragam Secl

Adm-39

6.11.16

Samarakoon

SUBJECT.

6/11

Ques 911 / Repr. 412/ 17/1-17

16

Office of Senior Surgeon, Mysore Govt.,

D. O. No. 145

Dated, Bangalore, 16-1-1917

D 2188

Med 5-16 Sl 9

Dear Sir,

With reference to your D.O. letter No. 2838, dated, 8th November 1916 and subsequent No. 4206, dated, 5th January 1917, I write to inform you that the attempts of the Medical Officer in charge of the Victoria Hospital/have so far failed to recover the amount due by Mr. Lawrence, who is reported to be an inmate of the Bowring Hospital, suffering from "a sort of mental aberration". The Medical Officer has been requested to make one more attempt and report the result which will be communicated to Government in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Personal Assistant
For Senior Surgeon.

D.M. Narasinga Rao Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, Bangalore.

med 5-165-C/10.

No. G. 393
Encls.

Office of Senior Surgeon, Mysore Govt.

Dated, Bangalore, May 21 1917 191

L. REC'D.
22 MAY 1917
D3406

From

Rajakarya Pravina
Rao Bahadur T. V. Arumugum Mudaliar, Esq., M. B., C. M.,
Senior Surgeon with the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

To

D. M. Narasinga Rao Esq., B.A., B.L;,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General Deptt., Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of this office D.O. letter No.145, dated, the 16th January 1917, I have the honor to state that the Medical Officer in charge of the Victoria Hospital, Bangalore, reports that Mr. Lawrence being reported to be an inmate of the Lunatic Asylum, Madras, it is not possible to correspond with him. Under the circumstances there is no chance of the amount being amicably recovered.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Personal Assistant
For Senior Surgeon
(absent from station).

From

The Senior Surgeon,

Mysore Govt., Bangalore.

To

The Secretary

to the Govt. of Mysore,

General Deptt.,

Bangalore.

Dated 19-5-1917.

No. G. 393

Encls.

Subject.

Reports that Mr: Lawrance being reported to be an inmate of the Lunatic Asylum Madras, there is no chance of the amount being amicably recovered.

1817 B W 18

G.R.S. VI-71]

SUBJECT..... Writing off a sum of Rs 10 due from Mr Lawrence on account of x-ray charges in the Victoria Hospital

Diary No. of letter replied to..... 3406

Section Med
File No. 5
Serial No. 16 H

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Med)

, the 191

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Date of issue..... 30.6.17.

Signed by..... Mr B. D. Kesava Iyengar

Read.— Correspondence ending with letter no: G 393 dated 19th May 1917 from the Senior Surgeon reporting that a sum of Rs 10 outstanding against Mr B. W. Lawrence in the accounts of the Victoria Hospital, Bangalore, on account of Charges for x-ray photos taken for him at his instance cannot be amicably recovered as the said Mr

May this be

i Printed?

ii treated as a standing order

iii published in the Gazette English part?

iv translated?

v placed at the disposal of the press?

vi published in the Gazette Kannada part?

~~Order Thereon: No.~~

over.

G 53/1916

19

Lawrence is reported
to be an inmate of the
Lunatic Asylum, Madras

Order GRH-3 med 5-16-11 8.28.6.17

Under the
Circumstances reported,
the sum of Rs 10 will be
written off the accounts.

for Secretary to Govt
Genl Depts
MC 27/6

To
The Senior Surgeon
& Comptroller
Govt Advocate Madras

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by